

Appl. No. 09/879,706
Atty. Docket No. 8481
Amdt. dated 03/05/2004
Reply to Office Action of 12/15/2003
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 2-8 are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form and is now believed to be allowable. Likewise, Claims 14-18 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Independent Claim 11 has been rewritten to include the limitations of Claim 14, which is canceled accordingly. Claim 17 is amended to ensure proper dependency.

Newly added Claim 19 recites that the device may comprise a DC voltage generator. Basis is found in the specification (7:7-10). No new matter is added.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Goodman et al. (5,964,703). As set forth in the Office Action, Goodman teaches a device applying an alternating current between the electrodes. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method having a monotonically increasing voltage applied between the electrodes, which is not contemplated by Goodman. Basis is found in the specification (8:10-11, 8:26-27, Figs. 4A-4C). No new matter is added.

Summary

All matters raised by the Office Action are believed to be addressed by the amendments made hereunder. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter for Claims 2-8 and 14-18. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and allow Claims 1-13 and 15-19 in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Larry L. Huston
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 32,994
(513) 634-9358

March 4, 2004
Customer No. 27752

BEST AVAILABLE COPY